



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,050	11/09/2001	Paul O. Sheppard	97-38C1	7831

7590 02/25/2004

Brian J. Walsh
ZymoGenetics, Inc.
1201 Eastlake Avenue East
Seattle, WA 98102

EXAMINER

MITRA, RITA

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1653

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/010,050	PAUL SHEPPARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rita Mitra	1653	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 09 November 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-11, and 20, drawn to an isolated polypeptide comprising a an amino acid sequence that is at least 80% identical in amino acid sequence to residues 31-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2, at least 90% identical in amino acid sequence to residues 29-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2, comprising residues 1-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2; fragments of amino acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 2; fusion protein, a pharmaceutical composition comprising the polypeptide of claim 1; classified in class 530, subclass 350; class 435, subclass 69.7
- II. Claims 12-19, 23-32, drawn to an expression vector comprising the operably linked elements such as: a promoter, terminator and a DNA segment encoding a polypeptide comprising an amino acid sequence that is at least 80% identical in amino acid sequence to residues 31-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2, at least 90% identical in amino acid sequence to residues 29-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2, comprising residues 1-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2; a cultured cell into which has been introduced an expression vector of claim 13; a method of producing a polypeptide by culturing the cell of claim 18, an isolated polynucleotide encoding a polypeptide comprising an amino acid sequence that is at least 80% identical in amino acid sequence to residues 31-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2, at least 90% identical in amino acid sequence to residues 29-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2, comprising residues 1-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2; fragments of nucleic acid sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1; an isolated polynucleotide encoding fusion protein; classified in class ; class 435, subclass 69.1, 69.7, 320.1, 252.3, class 536, subclass 23.1, 23.5, class 530, subclass 350.
- III. Claim 21, 22 drawn to an antibody and a binding protein that specifically binds to

Art Unit: 1653

an epitope of a polypeptide comprising a sequence of amino acid residues that is at least 80% identical in amino acid sequence to residues 31-346 of SEQ ID NO: 2; classified in class 530, subclass 387.1+.

- IV. Claim 33, drawn to a method for detecting a genetic abnormality in a patient using a nucleotide sequence of SEQ ID NO: 1; classified in class 536, subclass 23.1, 24.1, 24.3; class 435, subclass 6.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of making. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case, the protein product of invention I can be made by other materially distinct processes, such as purification from the natural source or by chemical synthesis. Therefore, the inventions are distinct.

The protein of invention I is related to the antibody of invention III as binding partners but with different amino acid sequence and different protein structures and number of polypeptide chains. They are distinct inventions because the protein can be used in another and materially different process from the use for production of the antibody, such as in a pharmaceutical composition in its own right, or to assay or purify the natural ligand of the protein if it is a receptor. Further, a protein and its cognate antibody are structurally and functionally distinct molecules with different amino acids.

Inventions I and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the polypeptide of invention I is not necessary for the practice of invention IV because invention IV requires nucleic acid for its practice. Therefore the inventions are distinct.

Art Unit: 1653

Inventions II and III are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the polynucleotide of invention II is a separate and distinct chemical entity from antibody of invention III. The nucleic acid does not encode the antibody. Therefore the inventions are distinct.

Inventions II and IV are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the polynucleotide of invention II can be used on other, materially distinct process, such as for recombinant production of protein. Therefore the inventions are distinct.

Inventions III and IV are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the antibody of group III would not have been used for the practice of the invention of group IV because the antibody would not have bound the nucleic acid as the antibody binds the polypeptide. Thus, the inventions are distinct.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art because of their recognized divergent subject matter, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.**

Art Unit: 1653

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai*, *In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.**

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently filed petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(h).

Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

A telephone call was made to Attorney Brian Walsh on December 9, 2003, to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the


Art Unit: 1653

Examiner should be directed to Rita Mitra whose telephone number is (703) 605-1211. The Examiner can normally be reached from 9:30 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on weekdays. If attempts to reach the Examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, Christopher Low, can be reached at (703) 308-2923. Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The Fax Center number is (703) 308-4242. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.



Rita Mitra, Ph.D.

February 17, 2004


CHRISTOPHER S. F. LOW
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600